

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-15 are currently pending.

Drawing Objections

In a previous Office Action, dated July 16, 200, the drawings were objected under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) for a minor informality. In a previous Office Action Response, the Applicant submitted a corrected drawing for approval by the Examiner. The Applicant respectfully requests an indication that the corrected drawing has been approved and the objection withdrawn in the next communication from the Examiner.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for being allegedly anticipated by Terada et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,990,247 (“Terada”). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 15 recite, *inter alia*, an electric motor that includes a first liquid barrier comprising at least one layer of polymeric resin material containing reinforcing fibers and a second liquid barrier comprising of at least one layer of a polymeric resin material containing reinforcing fibers.

The Office Action alleges that the insulator (67) disclosed by Terada reads upon the claimed first liquid barrier with reinforcing fibers (see Office Action, ¶4). The Office Action

alleges that the coil (63) reads upon the claimed layer of polymeric resin material for the first liquid barrier (See Office Action ¶4). The Office Action further alleges that that the molded portion (62) disclosed by Terada reads upon the claimed second liquid barrier with reinforcing fibers. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Terada fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention as recited by claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 15. More particularly, the Office Action alleges that the insulator (67) reads upon the first liquid barrier comprising of at least one layer of a polymeric resin containing reinforcing fibers. However, Terada fails to disclose the reinforcing fibers within insulator. In fact, Terada fails to mention reinforcing fibers with respect to the insulator. Instead, Terada merely discloses that the insulator is constructed from thermoplastic resins (col. 17, lines 7-9). Moreover, the Office Action alleges that coil (63) discloses the claimed polymeric resin. However, in electric motors, coils are typically constructed from copper or other metals. In fact, in the field of electric motors, coils are implemented with metallic materials in order to generate the electric field to spin the rotors. There is nothing in Terada that suggests that a polymeric resin can generate an electric material and the use of the polymeric resin as a coil would render any electric motor inoperative. Copper is not a polymeric resin. Accordingly, Terada fails to disclose a first liquid barrier comprising of at least one layer of polymeric resin containing reinforcing fibers.

Similarly, the Office Action relies on the molded portion 62 to disclose the second liquid barrier comprising of at least layer of polymeric resin containing reinforcing fiber. The molded portion 62 being the outside surface of the electric motor (See Terada, FIG. 6). However, Terada merely discloses the molded portion 62 being constructed from thermosetting resin and aliphatic

polyesters. Terada fails to disclose anywhere in the specification that reinforcing fibers are used in the molded portion 62. Accordingly, Terada fails to disclose a second liquid barrier comprising of at least one layer of polymeric resin containing reinforcing fibers.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 15 are distinguished from the cited prior art and it is, therefore, respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 2 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Terada. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 2 and 12 recite, *inter alia*, an electric motor that includes a first liquid barrier comprising at least one layer of polymeric resin material containing reinforcing fibers and a second liquid barrier comprising of at least one layer of polymeric resin material containing reinforcing fibers.

For at least the reasons given above, Terada fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention as recited by claims 2 and 12. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2 and 12 are allowable over the cited prior art and the rejection be withdrawn.

Moreover, the Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to include a strength element surrounding the second liquid barrier (see Office Action ¶6). The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Terada teaches away from using a strength element around the second liquid barrier. More particularly, Terada teaches a method of forming structures using a thermoplastic resin and aliphatic polyesters. The structures are then decomposed utilizing a base solution in order to improve the recovery of materials, e.g., iron cores and coils, in recycling operations (col. 2, lines

41-64; col. 20, lines 29-31). The addition of a strength material would hinder the recovery of the iron cores and coils. Accordingly, Terada teaches away from the use of a strength element surrounding the second liquid barrier.

Furthermore, Terada fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a strength element surrounding the second liquid barrier as claimed by claims 2 and 12. Any teaching or suggestion of a strength element is at best improper hindsight. Recognizing after the fact that such a modification would provide an improvement or advantage from a review of the present application, without suggestion thereof of the prior art is an indication of improper application of hindsight considerations. Again, simplicity and hindsight are not proper criteria for resolving obviousness.

The Office Action rejected claims 4 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Terada and in view of Monette et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,240,971 (“Monette”). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 4 and 14 recite, *inter alia*, an electric motor that includes a first liquid barrier comprising at least one layer of polymeric resin material containing reinforcing fibers and a second liquid barrier comprising of at least one layer of polymeric resin material containing reinforcing fibers.

For at least the reasons given above, Terada fails to disclose, teach or suggest the invention as recited by claims 4 and 14. Monette fails to rectify this deficiency. More particularly, Monette teaches a composite, fiber reinforced plastic structure having a wall portion defining a containment portion for the storage or passage of fluids or gasses (Monette, col. 2, lines 63-66). However, Monette fails to teach a first or second liquid barrier in an electric motor

much less a first and second liquid barrier comprising of at least one layer of polymeric resin material containing reinforcing fibers in the electric motor. Accordingly, Monette fails to teach each and every claim element of claim 4 and 14.

Since Terada and Monette each fails to suggest the invention as recited by claims 4 and 14, the combination of Terada and Monette also fails to teach each and every claim element of the claimed invention. Accordingly, the invention as recited by claims 4 and 14 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Furthermore, Terada and Monette are non-analogous art. More particularly, Terada teaches forming structures with thermosetting resins and dissolving the structures with a base solvent. Monette teaches a method of constructing a fiber reinforced plastic pipe for transporting crude oil and natural gas (Monette, col. 1, lines 16-18). Clearly, making structures from thermosetting resins and fiber-reinforced plastic are non-analogous art. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art of submersible electric motors would not look to the art of reinforced pipe. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted Terada and Monette are not properly combinable with respect to claims 4 and 14 and were only combined with impermissible hindsight. *See In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 1395, 170 U.S.P.Q. 209, 212, (CCPA 1971).

The Office Action rejected claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Terada in view of Junpei et al. U.S. Patent No. 3,577,024 (“Junpei”).

Claims 6-8 recite, *inter alia*, an electric motor that includes a first liquid barrier comprising at least one layer of polymeric resin material containing reinforcing and a second liquid barrier comprising of at least one layer of polymeric resin material containing reinforcing fibers.

As described above, Terada fail to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Junpei also fails to rectify the deficiencies of Terada. More particularly, Junpei fails to suggest or teach a first and second liquid barrier comprising of at least one layer of polymeric resin material containing reinforcing fibers.

Instead, Junpei suggests that a pair of oppositely directed helical grooves are formed on the peripheral surface of a rotor (Junpei, col. 1, lines 43-44). Junpei also suggests that the grooves create component of forces tending to push back cooling liquid (Junpei, col. 1, lines 47-48). However, Junpei fails to teach or suggest a first and second liquid barrier comprising of at least one layer of polymeric resin material containing reinforcing fibers. Accordingly, Junpei, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest each and every claim element of the invention as recited by claims 6-8 and it is, therefore, respectfully submitted that the invention as recited by claims 6-8 is patentable over the cited prior art.

The Office Action rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Terada.

Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*, an electric motor that includes a first liquid barrier comprising at least one layer of polymeric resin material containing reinforcing and a second liquid barrier comprising of at least one layer of polymeric resin material containing reinforcing fibers.

For at least the reasons given above, Terada fail to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, the invention as recited by claim 9 is distinguished over the cited prior art and it is, therefore, respectfully submitted that the invention as recited by claim 10 is patentable over the cited prior art.

The Office Action rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Terada.

Claim 10 recites, *inter alia*, an electric motor that includes a first liquid barrier comprising at least one layer of polymeric resin material containing reinforcing and a second liquid barrier comprising of at least one layer of polymeric resin material containing reinforcing fibers.

For at least the reasons given above, Terada fail to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, the invention as recited by claim 10 is distinguished over the cited prior art and it is, therefore, respectfully submitted that the invention as recited by claim 10 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Bell (Reg. No. 39,406)
Anderson I. Chen (Reg. No. 44,436)

Date: July 27, 2004

HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE, LLP
Box No. 34
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2402
(202) 783-0800